REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending. By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 9, 15, and 19 are amended to include the features of their respective dependent claims 22-25, which are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added.

For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

On page 5, item 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Echo (NPL, FLASH VS JAVA APPLETS), in view of Moock (NPL, The Art of Flash 5 Preloading), further in view of Chun (NPL, Flash 5 advanced for Windows and Macintosh). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Echo, Moock, Chun, or their combination fails to disclose or suggest display of a markup document and a linked applet within the markup document, wherein the applet is formed using the Java programming language, as recited in claims 1, 9, 15, and 19.

Each of Echo, Moock, and Chun are directed to flash. None are directed to an applet formed using the Java programming language. As previously discussed, flash is a type of an animation program, while such an applet formed using the Java programming language (referred to as a Java applet) is a type of a programming language executed in a Java Virtual Machine. A difference between the flash file and the Java applet is evident in the fact that for the flash file, frame by frame synchronizing is available since the flash file is made frame by frame. However, in an applet formed using the Java programming language, synchronizing is unavailable until the entire code of the Java applet is interpreted in the Java Virtual Machine since the applet in Java is made by a programming language. In contrast, Echo simply compares and contrasts flash with a Java applet. Echo is not directed to using an applet formed using the Java programming language, nor does Echo disclose or suggest that such a Java applet can be replaced with a flash.

Because Echo, Moock, and Chun are directed to flash and not to an applet formed using the Java programming language, claims 1, 9, 15, and 19 are patentably distinguishable over

Echo, Moock, Chun, or their combination. Claims 2-8 and 22, which depend from claim 1, claims 10-14 and 23, which depend from claim 9, claims 16-18 and 24, which depend from claim 15, and claims 20, 21 and 25, which depend from claim 19, are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied reference to Echo, Moock, Chun, or their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: _10/31/2007_   By: _Seth S. Kim_

Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510